# Feedback Capacity over Networks

Bo Li and Guodong Shi[‡]

arXiv:1701.03186v1 [cs.SY] 11 Jan 2017

**Abstract**

In this paper, we investigate the fundamental limitations of feedback mechanism in dealing with uncertainties for network systems. The study of maximum capability of feedback control was pioneered in Xie and Guo (2000) for scalar systems with nonparametric nonlinear uncertainty. In a network setting, nodes with unknown and nonlinear dynamics are interconnected through a directed interaction graph. Nodes can design feedback controls based on all available information, where the objective is to stabilize the network state. Using information structure and decision pattern as criteria, we specify three categories of network feedback laws, namely the global-knowledge/global-decision, network-flow/local-decision, and local-flow/local-decision feedback. We establish a series of network capacity characterizations for these three fundamental types of network control laws. First of all, we prove that for global-knowledge/global-decision and network-flow/local-decision control where nodes know the information flow across the entire network, there exists a critical number $\left(3/2+\sqrt{2}\right)/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty$, where $3/2+\sqrt{2}$ is as known as the Xie-Guo constant and $A_{\rm G}$ is the network adjacency matrix, defining exactly how much uncertainty in the node dynamics can be overcome by feedback. Interestingly enough, the same feedback capacity can be achieved under max-consensus enhanced local flows where nodes only observe information flows from neighbors as well as extreme (max and min) states in the network. Next, for local-flow/local-decision control, we prove that there exists a structure-determined value being a lower bound of the network feedback capacity. These results reveal the important connection between network structure and fundamental capabilities of in-network feedback control.

Keywords: adaptive control, nonlinear systems, feedback mechanism, network systems

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Lying at the heart of practicing and understanding control systems has been the feedback mechanism. Today it is recognized that the first systematic study of feedback control was made by J. C. Maxwell in

[*]The two authors contributed equally to this work.

[†]B. Li is with Key Lab of Mathematics Mechanization, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China. G. Shi is with the Research School of Engineering, The Australian National University, ACT 0200, Canberra, Australia. Email: libo@amss.ac.cn, guodong.shi@anu.edu.au

1868 on pendulum governors [1]. Invented by J. Watt to control his steam engine, the so-called fly-ball governor senses engine speed via the spinning angle of two weighted balls, and in the mean time adjusts the steam valve through levers connected to the balls [2]. The basic idea of feedback has since been clear from this historical example: the behaviour of a dynamical system can be regulated by feeding the outputs of the system back to its inputs, and particularly, via feedback unknown disturbances can be rejected to a desired level at the output end. How to design and optimize feedback controllers that can maximally reduce the effects of internal or external uncertainty becomes a central theme in the field of automatic control [3].

The influence of external uncertainty such as disturbances and sensor noises can be well and conveniently understood by classical frequency-based methods [2]. Treatments to internal and structural uncertainties that are ubiquitous in real-world plants are however far more challenging. There are two parallel but related major research paths along which celebrated results have been developed for discrete-time or continuous-time, linear or nonlinear, and autonomous or time-varying systems. Robust control synthesis [4, 5, 6, 7, 8] characterizes uncertainty within a prescribed (often compact) set around the true plant, and controllers are designed often to optimize certain performance metrics induced by the uncertainty neighborhood, e.g., maximizing performance for worst-case scenarios. Adaptive control methodology [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] utilizes online estimation techniques from the input-output signals, where controllers are adjusted in real time from the estimation outcomes.

The study of feedback control has been pushed forward to a new network era in the past decade, inspired by the emergence of a variety of dynamical systems of complex networks. The need of carrying out control and sensing over communication channels has led to the introduction of information theory to the study of control systems. Fundamental results have been established for the necessary data rate between the sensor and actuator for stabilizing a plant [15, 16, 17, 18, 19], and for the performance of control and estimation over lossy or noisy channels [20, 21]. Moreover, the notion of distributed control [22] sparkled a tremendous amount of work aiming at robust and scalable solutions for a large number of interconnected nodes to achieve collective goals ranging from consensus and formation to optimization and computation [23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. Multi-agent control has evolved to a discipline in its own right [28], being generalized even to control of quantum networks [29]. Of particular interest there is also the study of network controllability [30, 31, 32], focusing on how interaction structures influence network controllability when measurement and control take place at a few selected nodes.

## 1.2 Motivation

Besides the tremendous success of in-network control design [28], it is equally important to understand the limitations of feedback mechanism over network dynamics facing uncertainty. More specifically, a clear characterization to the capacity of feedback mechanism over a network in dealing with uncertainty, for centralized and distributed controllers, respectively, will help us understand the boundaries of controlling

complex networks from a theoretical perspective.

In the seminal work [33], Xie and Guo established fundamental results on the capability of feedback mechanism with nonparametric nonlinear uncertainty for the following discrete-time model

$$\mathbf{y}(t+1) = f(\mathbf{y}(t)) + \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{w}(t),\ t = 0, 1, \ldots$$

where the $\mathbf{y}(t)$, $\mathbf{u}(t)$, and $\mathbf{w}(t)$ are real numbers representing output, control, and disturbance, respectively. It was shown in [33] that with completely unknown plant model $f(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and bounded but unknown disturbance signal $\mathbf{w}(t)$, a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of stabilizing feedback control of the above system is that a type of Lipschitz norm of $f(\cdot)$ must be strictly smaller than $3/2 + \sqrt{2}$.

This number, now referred to as the *Xie-Guo constant* in the literature, points to fundamental limitations of *all* feedback laws. Generalizations have been made for a few types of parametric models for which the corresponding feedback capabilities can be characterized [34, 35, 36, 37]. Naturally we wonder (i) Would such a feedback capacity critical value exist for a network system? (ii) If it indeed exists, how would it depend on the network structure? (iii) How feedback capacity would differ between centralized and distributed controllers? Answers to these questions will add to fundamental understandings for control of networked systems and for feedback mechanism itself as well.

### 1.3 Main Results

We consider a network setting of the nonparametric uncertainty model in [33], where nodes with unknown nonlinear self-dynamics are interconnected through a directed interaction graph. For the ease of presentation the dynamics of the nodes are assumed to be identical, corresponding to homogenous networks. The interaction graph defines neighbor relations among the nodes, where measurement and control take place. Nodes can design any feedback controller using the information they have, and the objective is to stabilize the entire network, i.e., every node state in the network.

Three basic categories of feedback laws over such networks are carefully specified. In global-knowledge/global-decision feedback, every node knows network structure (interaction graph) and network information flow, and nodes can coordinate to make control decisions; in network-flow/local-decision feedback, each node only knows the network information flow and carries out decision individually; in local-flow/local-decision feedback, nodes only know information flow of neighbors and then make their own control decisions. Note that various existing distributed controllers and algorithms can be naturally put into one of the three categories. A series of network feedback capacity results has been established:

(i) For global-knowledge/global-decision and network-flow/local-decision control, the generic network feedback capacity is fully captured by a critical value

$$\big(3/2 + \sqrt{2}\big)/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty$$

where $A_{\mathrm{G}}$ is the network adjacency matrix.

(ii) For local-flow/local-decision control, there exists a structure-determined value being an lower bound of the network feedback capacity.

(iii) Network flow can be replaced by max-consensus enhanced local flows, where nodes only observe information flows from their neighbors as well as network extreme (max and min) states via max-consensus, and then the same feedback capacity can be reached.

Additionally, for strongly connected graphs, we manage to establish a universal impossibility theorem on the existence of stabilizing feedback laws.

### 1.4 Paper Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the network model and defines the problem of interest. Section 3 presents the main results, followed by Section 4 presenting the network stabilizing controllers. Section 5 provides the proofs of all the statements. Finally Section 6 concludes the paper by a few remarks pointing out a few interesting future directions.

*Notation*: The set of real numbers is denoted by $\mathbb{R}$, and the set of integers is denoted by $\mathbb{Z}$. A sequence $a_0, a_1, \ldots$ is abbreviated as $\langle a_t \rangle_{t\geq 0}$. For any real number $a$, $(a)^+$ is defined as $(a)^+ = \max\{a, 0\}$. For convenience we use $\text{dist}(X, Y)$ to denote the distance between two sets $X$ and $Y$ in $\mathbb{R}$ by $\text{dist}(X, Y) = \inf_{x\in X, y\in Y} |x - y|$, and simply $\text{dist}(a, Y) := \inf_{y\in Y} |a - y|$, $\text{dist}(a, b) = |a - b|$ for real numbers $a$ and $b$.

## 2 The Model

### 2.1 Network Dynamics with Uncertainty

Consider a network with $n$ nodes indexed in the set $\mathrm{V} = \{1, ..., n\}$. The network interconnection structure is represented by a directed graph $\mathrm{G} = (\mathrm{V}, \mathrm{E})$, where E is the arc set. Each arc $(i, j)$ in the set E is an ordered pair of two nodes $i, j \in \mathrm{V}$, and link $(i, i)$ is allowed at each node $i$ defining a self-arc. The neighbors of node $i$, that node $i$ can be influenced by, is defined as nodes in the set $\mathrm{N}_i := \{j : (j, i) \in \mathrm{E}\}$. Let $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ be a real number representing the weight of the directed arc $(j, i)$ for $i, j \in \mathrm{V}$. The arc weights $a_{ij}$ comply with the network structure in the sense that $a_{ij} \neq 0$ if and only if $(j, i) \in \mathrm{E}$. Let $A_{\mathrm{G}}$ be the adjacency matrix of the graph G with $[A_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij} = a_{ij}$.

Time is slotted at $t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Each node $i$ holds a state $\mathbf{x}_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ at time $t$. The dynamics of the $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ are described by

$$\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) = \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \mathbf{u}_i(t) + \mathbf{w}_i(t),\ i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{1}$$

where $f$ is a function mapping from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{u}_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the control input, and $\mathbf{w}_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the disturbance. We impose the following standing assumptions.




Figure 1: A graphical diagram of the considered network model: (i) Interaction structure forms a directed graph where nodes are influenced by their in-neighbors and influence their out-neighbors; (ii) Node interaction rules are governed by completely unknown nonlinear dynamics and link width indicates the weight (strength) of interactions; (iii) Control inputs are applied to individual nodes subject to unknown disturbances.

**Assumption 1**. (*Dynamics Uncertainty*) The function $f$ is unknown, and the arc weight $a_{ij}$ is known to the node $i$.

**Assumption 2**. (*Disturbance Boundedness*) The process disturbance $\mathbf{w}_i(t)$ is unknown but bounded, i.e., there exists $w_* > 0$ such that $\left|\mathbf{w}_i(t)\right| \leq w_*$ for all $t$ and for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$, and further, the bound $w_*$ is unknown.

**Assumption 3**. (*Feasible Estimates*) At time $t+1$, each node $i$ has access to $\mathbf{z}_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\left|f(\mathbf{x}_i(t)) - \mathbf{z}_i(t)\right| \leq D_0 \tag{2}$$

for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$ and for all $t = 0, 1, \ldots,$ where $D_0$ is an unknown constant.

The Assumptions 1–2 are quite natural and general. Assumption 3 is on the other hand a technical assumption that is designed to ease our presentation while maintaining the essence of problem. Practically the $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$ allows node $i$ to observe an estimation of $f(\mathbf{x}_i(t))$ at time $t+1$, excitation of its plant at the previous state $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$, which is certainly not a hard requirement. We will show that with global information, in many cases such required estimations of $f(\mathbf{x}_i(t))$ can actually be obtained from the nodes states; with local information, such a requirement relies on local node observations and is essential to form a feasible problem scope. Assumptions 1–3 are adopted throughout the remainder of the paper without specific further mention. An illustration of this dynamical network model can be seen in Fig. 1.

### 2.2 Feedback Laws over Networks

We now classify all possible network feedback control laws into categories determined by *information patterns* and *decision structures*. Such a classification is not straightforward at all bearing the following questions in mind:

(i) (*Knowledge*) How much would nodes know about the network itself, e.g., number of nodes $n$, network connectivity, or even the network topology G?

(ii) (*Flows*) How much would nodes know about the network information flows, e.g., availability of $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$, $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$, and $\mathbf{u}_i(t)$ for a neighbor, or a neighbors' neighbor of the node $i$?

(iii) (*Decisions*) To what level nodes could cooperate in determining the control actions, e.g., can a node $i$ tell a neighbor $j$ to stand by with $\mathbf{u}_j(t) = 0$ at time $t$ to implement its own control input $\mathbf{u}_i(t)$?

Different answers to these questions will lead to drastically different scopes of network control rules. In this paper, we focus on a few fundamental forms of network feedback laws that from a theoretical perspective represent a variety of network control and computation results in the literature.

Denote $\mathbf{X}(t) = (\mathbf{x}_1(t) \ \dots \ \mathbf{x}_n(t))^\top$, $\mathbf{Z}(t) = (\mathbf{z}_1(t) \ \dots \ \mathbf{z}_n(t))^\top$, and $\mathbf{U}(t) = (\mathbf{u}_1(t) \ \dots \ \mathbf{u}_n(t))^\top$. The following definition specifies network and local flows.

**Definition 1** *The network flow vector up to time $t$ is defined as*

$$\Theta(t) := \Big(\mathbf{X}(0), \dots, \mathbf{X}(t); \mathbf{Z}(0), \dots, \mathbf{Z}(t-1); \mathbf{U}(0), \dots, \mathbf{U}(t-1)\Big)^\top.$$

*The local network flow vector for node $i$ up to time $t$ is defined as*

$$\Theta_i(t) := \Big(\mathbf{x}_j(0), \dots, \mathbf{x}_j(t); \mathbf{z}_j(0), \dots, \mathbf{z}_j(t-1); \mathbf{u}_j(0), \dots, \mathbf{u}_j(t-1) : j \in \mathrm{N}_i \bigcup \{i\}\Big)^\top.$$

Note that, here we have assumed that the $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$, $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$, and $\mathbf{u}_i(t)$ are known to a node $i$ even if it does not hold a self arc $(i, i) \in \mathrm{E}$ (therefore $i \notin \mathrm{N}_i$). This is indeed quite natural and general which simplifies the presentation considerably.

#### 2.2.1 Global-Knowledge/Global-Decision Feedback

Recall that $A_{\mathrm{G}}$ is the adjacency matrix of the graph G. Network controllers that have omniscient narration and omnipotent actuators at all nodes are certainly of primary interest.

**Definition 2** *A network control rule in the form of*

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = \mathcal{h}_t\Big(\Theta(t); A_{\mathrm{G}}\Big), \quad t = 0, 1, \dots \tag{3}$$

*where $\mathcal{h}_t$ is an arbitrary function mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{n(3t+1)}$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $A_{\mathrm{G}}$ being a common knowledge, is termed a Global-Knowledge/Global-Decision Feedback Law for the network system (1).*

To implement a global-knowledge/global-decision network control, one requires a network operator who knows the structure of the network (topology and arc weights), collects states and signals across the entire network, and then enforces control decisions on each individual node.

### 2.2.2 Network-Flow/Local-Decision Feedback

Knowing the network flow, nodes can still carry out individual control decisions even without knowledge of the entire network structure G. This will incur restrictions on feasible control rules, leading to the following definition.

**Definition 3** *A network control rule in the form of*

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = \mathcal{h}_t^i\Big(\Theta(t); [A_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij}, j \in \mathrm{N}_i\Big) \tag{4}$$

*where independent with other nodes, $\mathcal{h}_t^i$ is an arbitrary function mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathrm{N}_i \cup \{i\}|(3t+1)}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ for any $t = 0, 1, \ldots,$ is termed a Network-Flow/Local-Decision Feedback Law for the network system (1).*

The $\mathcal{h}_t^i$ being independent means that a node $m$ can determine its control rule $\mathcal{h}_t^m$ without knowing or influencing the exact control decision values at any other node and for any given time. The following example helps clarify the ambiguity in the notion of independent decisions.

**Example 1**. Consider two nodes 1 and 2. The following control rule with $\mathcal{q}_t$ being a function with proper dimension for its argument

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_1(t) &= \mathcal{q}_t(\Theta(t)) \\ \mathbf{u}_2(t) &= 1 - \mathcal{q}_t(\Theta(t)) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

implicitly holds the identity

$$\mathbf{u}_1(t) + \mathbf{u}_2(t) = 1$$

and therefore can only be implemented if the two nodes coordinate their respective inputs. In this sense (5) is a global-knowledge/global-decision feedback rather than a network-flow/local-decision feedback law. □

### 2.2.3 Local-Flow/Local-Decision Feedback

The notion of distributed control consists of three basis elements [28]: nodes only have a local knowledge of the network structure; nodes only receive and send information to a few neighbors; control and decision are computed by each node independently. Inspired by these criteria we impose the following definition.

**Definition 4** *Any feedback control rule in the form of*

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = \mathcal{h}_t^i\Big(\Theta_i(t); [A_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij}, j \in \mathrm{N}_i\Big) \tag{6}$$

*with* $\hbar_t^i : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathrm{N}_i \cup \{i\}|(3t+1)} \to \mathbb{R}$ *being an arbitrary function independent with other nodes, is termed a Local-Flow/Local-Decision Feedback Law for the network system (1).*

The three classes of network feedback laws are certainly not disjoint. In fact the set of global-knowledge /global-decision feedback contains the set of network-flow/local-decision feedback, which in turn contains the set of local-flow/local-decision feedback.

### 2.3 Network Stabilizability

We are interested in the existence of feedback control laws that stabilize the network dynamics (1) for the closed loop, as indicated in the following definition.

**Definition 5** *A feedback law stabilizes the network dynamics (1) if there holds*

$$\sup_{t\geq 0}\Big(\big|\mathbf{x}_i(t)\big| + \big|\mathbf{u}_i(t)\big|\Big) < \infty,\ \forall i \in \mathrm{V} \tag{7}$$

*for the closed loop system.*

It is easy to see that the stabilizing condition $\sup_{t\geq 0}(|\mathbf{x}_i(t)| + |\mathbf{u}_i(t)|) < \infty$ is simply equivalent to

$$\sup_{t\geq 0}|\mathbf{x}_i(t)| < \infty.$$

### 2.4 Discussions

In this subsection, we provide some additional discussions on suitable function space for the node dynamical mode $f$ and the possible mechanism of nodes obtaining the estimates $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$.

#### 2.4.1 Function Space

We need a metric quantifying the uncertainty in the node dynamical mode $f$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the space that contains all $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ functions, where the $f \in \mathcal{F}$ are equipped with a quasi-norm defined by[1]

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{q}} := \lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\sup_{x,y\in\mathbb{R}}\frac{|f(x)-f(y)|}{|x-y|+\alpha}.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{F}_L := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : \|f\|_q \leq L\}$$

as a subspace in $\mathcal{F}$ consisting of functions bounded by $L > 0$ under quasi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{q}}$. Functions in $\mathcal{F}_L$ can certainly be discontinuous, but they are closely related to Lipschitz continuous functions. The following lemma holds, whose proof can be found in [33].

[1] We refer to [33] for a thorough explanation of this quasi-norm and the resulting function space $\mathcal{F}$.

**Lemma 1** *Let $\|f\|_{\mathrm{q}} \leq L$. Then for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $c \geq 0$ such that*

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq (L + \eta)|x - y| + c, \ \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{8}$$

Based on Lemma 1, the set $\Gamma_L(f) := \big\{(\eta, c) : \text{Eq. (8) holds}\big\}$ is nonempty for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$. We further define for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ and $r > L$

$$\mathfrak{W}_f(r) := \inf\big\{c : L + \eta < r, (\eta, c) \in \Gamma_L(f)\big\}. \tag{9}$$

#### 2.4.2 Estimation $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$

In vector form the system (1) can be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1(t+1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_n(t+1) \end{bmatrix} = A_{\mathrm{G}} \begin{bmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_1(t)) \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathbf{x}_n(t)) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{u}_n(t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{w}_n(t) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{10}$$

Then if $A_{\mathrm{G}}$ is nonsingular, at time $t+1$,

$$\mathbf{Z}(t) = A_{\mathrm{G}}^{-1}\Big(\mathbf{X}(t+1) - \mathbf{U}(t)\Big) = \begin{bmatrix} f(\mathbf{x}_1(t)) \\ \vdots \\ f(\mathbf{x}_n(t)) \end{bmatrix} + A_{\mathrm{G}}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{w}_n(t) \end{bmatrix} \tag{11}$$

provides an estimate of $(f(\mathbf{x}_1(t)) \dots f(\mathbf{x}_n(t))^\top$ that satisfies Assumption 3. In other words, with the knowledge of a nonsingular adjacency matrix, the required estimation $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$ can be calculated at each node $i$ entirely based on the history of the network states and inputs.

**Remark 1** *We would like to point out that with $A_{\mathrm{G}}$ being singular, at time $t+1$, (11) can be replaced by the least squares estimate of $(f(\mathbf{x}_1(t)) \dots f(\mathbf{x}_n(t))^\top$ in (10), where again only the information of $\mathbf{X}(t+1)$ and $\mathbf{U}(t)$ are used. The resulting estimation might not satisfy Assumption 3, but potentially it can be equally useful in designing feedback controllers.*

On the other hand, with local information structure, it is certainly hard or even impossible for the nodes to calculate the required $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$ purely based on the state and input history of neighbors. Therefore, $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$ can only be direct observation of $f(\mathbf{x}_i(t))$ at the plant of node $i$ at time $t+1$, which is reasonable because this observation happens after the excitation of the plant at time $t$ and noisy observation is allowed. This is independent with whether there is a self link at node $i$ since it is the $f(\mathbf{x}_i(t))$ that influences nodes holding $i$ as a neighbor. The estimates $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$ at each individual nodes of course can then be shared among neighborhood, leading to the local information flow vector $\Theta_i(t+1)$ at each node $i$ and at time $t+1$.

# 3 Network Stabilizability Theorems

In this section, we present a series of possibility and/or impossibility results for the stabilizability of the network dynamics (1) for the three categories of feedback laws.

## 3.1 Global-Knowledge/Global-Decision Feedback

With global-knowledge/global-decision feedback, it turns out that, the infinity norm $\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty$ of the the adjacency matrix $A_{\rm G}$, i.e.,

$$\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty = \max_{i\in {\rm V}} \sum_{j\in {\rm N}_i} \big|[A_{\rm G}]_{ij}\big|$$

plays a critical role.

Recall that $D_0$ is the estimation bound for $\mathbf{z}_i(t)$ introduced in (2) and $\mathfrak{W}_f(\cdot)$ is the function defined in (9). The following theorem characterizes a generic fundamental limit for the capacity of global-knowledge/global-decision feedback laws.

**Theorem 1 (Generic Fundamental Limit)** *Consider $\mathcal{F}_L$ in the function space $\mathcal{F}$. Then there exists a generic Global-Knowledge/Global-Decision feedback law that stabilizes the network dynamics (1) if and only if*

$$L < (3/2+\sqrt{2})/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty.$$

*To be precise, the following statements hold.*

*(i) If $L < (3/2+\sqrt{2})/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty$, then there exists a global-knowledge/global-decision feedback control law that stabilizes the system (1) for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ and for all interaction graphs* G. *In fact, with $L < (3/2+\sqrt{2})/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty$ we can find a global-knowledge/global-decision feedback control law that ensures*

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} |\mathbf{x}_i(t)| \le \Big(\mathfrak{W}_f\big(3/2+\sqrt{2})/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty\big) + D_0\Big)\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty + w_*,\ \forall i \in {\rm V}.$$

*(ii) If $L \ge (3/2+\sqrt{2})/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty$, then for any global-knowledge/global-decision feedback law (3) and any initial value $\mathbf{X}(0)$, there exist an interaction graph* G *and a function $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ under which there holds*

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \max_{i\in {\rm V}} |\mathbf{x}_i(t)| = \infty.$$

Note that, the critical value $L < (3/2+\sqrt{2})/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty$ established in Theorem 1 is for general interaction graphs. In fact, as will be shown in its proof, the graph constructed for the necessity proof is a very special one containing exactly one self arc. For a given graph G, e.g., a complete graph or a directed cycle, it is certainly possible that the corresponding network dynamics are stabilizable even with $L \ge (3/2+\sqrt{2})/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty$. Find such feedback capacity values for any given interaction graph seems to be rather challenging, as illustrated in the following example.

Figure 2: A simple two-node network with two self links only.

**Example 2.** Consider two nodes, indexed by 1 and 2, respectively, which both possess a self link with unit weight and have no link between them (see Fig. 2). From our standing network model their dynamics read as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_1(t+1) &= f(\mathbf{x}_1(t)) + \mathbf{w}_1(t) + \mathbf{u}_1(t) \\ \mathbf{x}_2(t+1) &= f(\mathbf{x}_2(t)) + \mathbf{w}_2(t) + \mathbf{u}_2(t). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

A first sight indicates that (12) appears to be merely two copies of the scaler model considered in [33]. Indeed, directly from results established in [33], we know that if $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ with $L < (3/2 + \sqrt{2})$, we can stabilize each $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ with control input $\mathbf{u}_i(t)$ being a feedback from its own dynamics. However, note that with global information, one cannot rule out the case where

(i) Node 1 stabilizes itself;

(ii) Node 2 uses the information flow vector[2] at the node 1:

$$\Theta_1^*(t) := \Big(\mathbf{x}_1(0), \ldots, \mathbf{x}_1(t); \mathbf{z}_1(0), \ldots, \mathbf{z}_1(t-1); \mathbf{u}_1(0), \ldots, \mathbf{u}_1(t-1)\Big)^\top$$

to design its controller.

In fact, $\Theta_1^*(t)$ can be rather informative even for node 2 because it can be utilized putting an effective estimate to the unknown function $f(\cdot)$, which is essential for $\mathbf{u}_2(t)$. Furthermore, one cannot rule out an even more interesting scenario where nodes 1 and 2 design their controllers *cooperatively* since now they share a common information set. Therefore, it is not clear whether the critical feedback capacity value $3/2 + \sqrt{2}$, which applies to the two nodes respectively when they are separate [33], will continue to apply when they form a network with shared information. An intuitive way of understanding this is that while the two nodes in system (12) share no *dynamical* interaction, a global view of the network information flow will create hidden *intellectual* interaction through their control inputs. □

Furthermore, we introduce

$$\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp = \min_{i,j \in \mathrm{V}} \Big\{ \big|[A_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij}\big| : [A_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij} \neq 0 \Big\}$$

[2]Node that $\mathbf{z}_1(t)$ can simply be chosen as $\mathbf{x}_1(t+1) - \mathbf{u}_1(t)$.

where of course $\|A_{\rm G}\|_\sharp = 0$ if $A_{\rm G} = 0$. It is easy to verify that $\|\cdot\|_\sharp$ is not even a proper matrix semi-norm. The following result however provides a further impossibility characterization of global-knowledge/global-decision feedback laws for networks with strong connectivity based on the metric $\|A_{\rm G}\|_\sharp$.

**Theorem 2 (Impossibility Theorem with Connectivity)** *Suppose the underlying graph* G *is strongly connected. Assume that either* $[A_{\rm G}]_{ij} \geq 0$ *for all* $i, j \in {\rm V}$ *or* $[A_{\rm G}]_{ij} \leq 0$ *for all* $i, j \in {\rm V}$. *If* $L \geq 4/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\sharp$, *then for any Global-Knowledge/Global-Decision Feedback Law (3) and any initial value* $\mathbf{X}(0)$, *there exists a function* $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ *under which there always holds*

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} |\mathbf{x}_i(t)| = \infty.$$

### 3.2 Network-Flow/Local-Decision Feedback

It is obvious from its definition that any network-flow/local-decision feedback law is by itself a global-knowledge/global-decision control as well. In other words, any possibility result for network stabilization achieved by network-flow/local-decision feedback laws can also be viewed as a possibility result for global-knowledge/global-decision controls. Remarkably enough, the contrary also holds true for generic graphs, as indicated in the following result.

**Theorem 3 (Generic Fundamental Limit)** *Consider* $\mathcal{F}_L$ *in the function space* $\mathcal{F}$. *Then there exists a generic Network-Flow/Local-Decision Feedback Law that stabilizes the network dynamics (1) if and only if* $L < (3/2 + \sqrt{2})/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty$.

In fact, the error bound in Theorem 1.(i) continues to hold for network-flow/local-decision feedback laws. Putting Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 together we learn that, for generic interaction graphs, information flow plays a more critical role for feedback capacity compared to decision structures.

### 3.3 Local-Flow/Local-Decision Feedback

Recall that $a_{ij} = [A_{\rm G}]_{ij}$ is the weight of arc $(j, i) \in {\rm E}$. Let $\langle p_t^i\rangle_{t=1}^\infty$ and $\langle q_t^i\rangle_{t=1}^\infty$ be non-negative sequences for $i \in {\rm V}$ that satisfy the following recursive relations:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{t+1}^i &\leq \Big(M \sum_{j\in{\rm N}_i} |a_{ij}| \max_{1\leq s\leq t}\{p_s^j, q_s^j\} + \omega - \sum_{s=1}^t p_s^i\Big)^+, \\ q_{t+1}^i &\leq \Big(M \sum_{j\in{\rm N}_i} |a_{ij}| \max_{1\leq s\leq t}\{p_s^j, q_s^j\} + \omega - \sum_{s=1}^t q_s^i\Big)^+. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Induced by recursion (13), we present the following metric for the matrix $A_{\rm G}$

$$\|A_{\rm G}\|_\dagger := \sup\Big\{M : \text{For any } \omega > 0 \text{ Eq.(13) implies } \sum_{t=1}^\infty (p_t^i + q_t^i) < \infty \text{ for all } i \in {\rm V}\Big\}. \tag{14}$$

Note that the positivity of $\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\dagger$ can be shown for nontrivial graphs G by establishing $\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\dagger \geq 1/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty$. This observation enabling that $\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\dagger$ be a meaningful metric for the graph G has been put in Lemma 4 as Appendix.

The following theorem establishes a sufficiency condition for feedback stabilizability of the network dynamics, effectively providing a lower bound of the feedback capacity for local-flow/local-decision feedback laws.

**Theorem 4 (Generic Possibility Theorem)** *Consider $\mathcal{F}_L$ in the function space $\mathcal{F}$. There exists a generic Local-Flow/Local-Decision Feedback Law that stabilizes the network dynamics (1) if*

$$L/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\dagger < 1.$$

*More precisely, if $L < \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\dagger$, then there exists a Local-Information/Local-Decision feedback law that stabilizes the network dynamics (1) for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ and all graphs* G.

### 3.4 Max-Consensus Enhanced Feedback Capacity

It is evident from the above discussions that knowledge of information flows heavily influences the capacity of feedback laws. Network flow enables universal feedback laws that apply to generic graphs as shown in Theorem 1 and Theorem 3, while local flows can be rather insufficient in stabilizing a network with uncertainty.

However, various distributed algorithms have been developed in the literature serving the aim of achieving collective goals using local node interactions only, which often leads to propagation of certain global information to local levels. One particular type of such algorithms is the so-called *max-consensus*, where a network of nodes holding real values can agree on the network maximal value in finite time steps by distributed interactions [23, 38]. Max-consensus algorithms themselves have been adapted to various settings in complex networks [39], and have been applied to many engineering problems such as sensor network synchronization [40]. In this subsection, we show simple max-consensus algorithms can fundamentally change the nature of network feedback capacity.

[**Max-Consensus Enhancement**] At time $t$, each node $i$ holds a vector $\mathbf{m}_i(t) = (\mathbf{x}_i(t), \mathbf{z}_i(t))^\top$. From time $t$ to $(t+1)^-$, nodes run a max-consensus algorithm on the first entry by

$$\mathbf{m}_i[k+1] = (\mathbf{x}_{\arg\max_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} \mathbf{x}_j[k]}, \mathbf{z}_{\arg\max_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} \mathbf{x}_j[k]})^\top$$

where with slight abuse of notation we neglect the time index $t$ in $\mathbf{m}_i$, $\mathbf{x}_i$, and $\mathbf{z}_i$, and use $[k]$ to represent time steps in the max-consensus algorithm. It is clear [38] that in a finite number of steps in $k$ (therefore it is safe to assume before time $t+1$), all nodes will hold

$$(\overline{\mathbf{x}}(t), \overline{\mathbf{z}}(t))^\top$$

with $\overline{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \max_i \mathbf{x}_i(t)$ and $\overline{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \mathbf{z}_{\arg\max_{j\in \mathrm{V}} \mathbf{x}_j(t)}(t)$.

Similarly, $(\underline{\mathbf{x}}(t), \underline{\mathbf{z}}(t))^\top$ with $\underline{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \min_i \mathbf{x}_i(t)$ and $\underline{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \mathbf{z}_{\arg\min_{j\in \mathrm{V}} \mathbf{x}_j(t)}(t)$ can also be possessed by all nodes $i$ before time $t+1$ with another parallel min-consensus algorithm. We are now ready to introduce the following definition.

**Definition 6** *The max-consensus enhanced local flow vector for node $i$ up to time $t$ is defined as*

$$\Theta_i^{\mathrm{e}}(t) := \Big(\Theta_i(t)^\top\ \overline{\mathbf{x}}(0), \ldots, \overline{\mathbf{x}}(t), \underline{\mathbf{x}}(0), \ldots, \underline{\mathbf{x}}(t), \overline{\mathbf{z}}(0), \ldots, \overline{\mathbf{z}}(t-1), \underline{\mathbf{z}}(0), \ldots, \underline{\mathbf{z}}(t-1)\Big)^\top.$$

*Moreover, any feedback control rule in the form of*

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = \mathit{\hbar}_t^i\Big(\Theta_i^{\mathrm{e}}(t); [A_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij}, j \in \mathrm{N}_i\Big) \tag{15}$$

*with $\mathit{\hbar}_t^i$ being an arbitrary function independent with other nodes, is termed a Max-Enhanced-Local-Flow/ Local-Decision Feedback Law for the network system (1).*

It turns out that, max-consensus-enhanced-local-flow/local-decision feedback laws have the same capacity in stabilizing the generic network dynamics (1) as the global-knowledge/global-decision feedback.

**Theorem 5 (Generic Fundamental Limit)** *Consider $\mathcal{F}_L$ in the function space $\mathcal{F}$. Then there exists a generic Max-Consensus-Enhanced-Local-Flow/Local-Decision Feedback Law that stabilizes the network dynamics (1) if and only if $L < (3/2 + \sqrt{2})/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty$.*

Although Theorem 5 exhibits the same fundamental limit as Theorem 1, the error bound of $\limsup_{t\to\infty} |\mathbf{x}_i(t)|$ becomes inevitably more conservative. This suggests potential difference at performance levels for the two different types of controllers.

# 4 The Feedback Laws

In this section, we present the control rules that are used in the possibility claims of the above network stabilization theorems.

## 4.1 Local Feedback with Network Flow

We now present a local feedback controller in the form of Definition 3 with entire network flow information. Denote

$$\overline{\mathbf{y}}(t) := \max\{\mathbf{x}_i(s) : s = 0, \ldots, t; i = 1, \ldots, n\}, \tag{16}$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) := \min\{\mathbf{x}_i(s) : s = 0, \ldots, t; i = 1, \ldots, n\}. \tag{17}$$

as the maximal and minimal states at all nodes and among all time steps up to $t$, respectively. The controller contains two parts, an estimator and a distributed feedback rule.

[**Estimator**] For each $i \in \mathrm{V}$, $t \geq 1$, there exists $[v_i]_t \in \mathrm{V}$ and $0 \leq [s_i]_t \leq t-1$ that satisfies

$$\mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t) \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}_j(\tau)} \Big\{ |\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(\tau)| : j \in \mathrm{V}, \tau \in [0, t-1] \Big\}. \tag{18}$$

Then at time $t$, an estimator for $f(\mathbf{x}_i(t))$ made by nodes that are $i$'s neighbors is given by

$$\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_i(t)) := \mathbf{z}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t). \tag{19}$$

[**Feedback**] Fix any positive $\epsilon$. Let $\mathbf{u}_i(0) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$. For all $t \geq 1$ and all $i \in \mathrm{V}$, we define

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = \begin{cases} -\sum\limits_{j \in \mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_j(t)), & \text{if } |\mathbf{x}_k(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_k]_t}([s_k]_t)| \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } k \in \mathrm{V}; \\ -\Big( \sum\limits_{j \in \mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} \widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) \Big) + \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

It is clear that Eq. (19)–(20) lead to a well defined Network-Flow/Local-Decision feedback control law that is consistent with Definition 3. In the following, we will prove that it suffices to use the control law (19)–(20) to establish the stabilizability statements in Theorem 1 and Theorem 3.

## 4.2 Global Feedback with Global Information

The feedback controller given in (19)–(20) already manages to support the stabilization statement in Theorem 1 as well since by definition a local-decision controller is a special form of global-decision controllers. It is however of independent interest seeing how stabilizing network controllers with essentially centralized structure might work. A clear answer to this question for general graphs seems rather difficult. Nevertheless, we have been able to construct two insightful examples, with the interaction graphs being a directed path and a directed cycle (see Fig. 3), respectively, which partially illustrates some spirit of the problem.

### 4.2.1 Path Graph

Consider the path graph with exactly one self link at the root node[3] shown in Fig. 3 with $a_{11} = 1$. Let us consider the following network controller.

[**Control at root node**]: For each $t \geq 1$, there exists $0 \leq s_t \leq t-1$ that satisfies

$$\mathbf{x}_1(s_t) \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}_1(\tau)} \Big\{ |\mathbf{x}_1(t) - \mathbf{x}_1(\tau)| : \tau \in [0, t-1] \Big\}. \tag{21}$$

At time $t$, an estimator for $f(\mathbf{x}_1(t))$ is given by

$$\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_1(t)) := \mathbf{z}_1(s_t).$$

[3]This self link is added for the sake of providing a nontrivial example yet as simple as possible.




Figure 3: A directed path graph with one self link at the root node (left), and a directed cycle graph (right). For these two graphs we can construct essential global-decision controllers that will stabilize the network states.

We define

$$\mathbf{u}_1(t) = -\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_1(t)) + \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1(t) + \overline{\mathbf{x}}_1(t)),$$

[**Control at other nodes**]: $\mathbf{u}_i(t) = 0$ for all $i = 2, \ldots, n$ and all $t$.

The above network controller will stabilize the node states for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ with $L < 3/2 + \sqrt{2}$ citing the result of [33] directly. To implement such a controller, nodes need to know the network structure: node 1 must know it is a root. All nodes must know G is a directed path. Nodes $2, \ldots, n$ must also know that the controller at node 1 will stabilize $\mathbf{x}_1(t)$. Therefore, the controller falls into the category of global-knowledge/global-decision network control, but not into other categories in our definition.

### 4.2.2 Cycle Graph

Consider the directed cycle graph shown in Fig. 3 and assume all arc weights are equal to one. Define $\kappa(b)$ for any (positive, negative, or zero) integer $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ by $\kappa(b)$ being the unique integer satisfying $1 \leq \kappa(b) \leq n$ and $\kappa(b) = b \mod n$.

[**Controller**] For each node $i \in \mathrm{V}$, there exists $0 \leq [s_i]_t \leq t-1$ that satisfies

$$\mathbf{x}_{\kappa([s_i]_t - t + i - 1)}\big([s_i]_t\big) \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}_{\kappa(\tau - t + i - 1)}(\tau)} \Big\{ |\mathbf{x}_{\kappa(i-1)}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{\kappa(\tau - t + i - 1)}(\tau)| : 0 \leq \tau \leq t-1 \Big\}. \tag{22}$$

An estimator for $f(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa(i-1)}(t))$ is given by

$$\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa(i-1)}(t)) := \mathbf{z}_{\kappa([s_i]_t - t + i - 1)}\big([s_i]_t\big).$$

Let $\mathbf{u}_i(0) = 0$. For $t \geq 1$, let

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = -\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa(i-1)}(t)) + \Big( \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa(\tau - t + i - 1)}(\tau) + \min_{0 \leq \tau \leq t} \mathbf{x}_{\kappa(\tau - t + i - 1)}(\tau) \Big)/2. \tag{23}$$

Clearly (23) relies essentially on global decisions because the node number and the cycle structure are necessary knowledge and more importantly, the inherent symmetry in (23) requires coordination among the nodes. Suppose $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ with $L < 3/2 + \sqrt{2}$. Now we show the controller (23) indeed stabilizes the network dynamics.

According to (1) and the cyclic network structure, for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, there holds

$$\mathbf{x}_{\kappa(i+t+1)}(t+1) = f(\mathbf{x}_{\kappa(i+t)}(t)) + \mathbf{u}_{\kappa(i+t+1)}(t) + \mathbf{w}_{\kappa(i+t+1)}(t). \tag{24}$$

We further write $[x_i]_t = \mathbf{x}_{\kappa(i+t)}(t)$, $[w_i]_t = \mathbf{w}_{\kappa(i+t+1)}(t)$, and also $\overline{[x_i]}_t = \max\limits_{0\le s\le t}[x_i]_s$, $\underline{[x_i]}_t = \min\limits_{0\le s\le t}[x_i]_s$. With these new variables (24) becomes

$$[x_i]_{t+1} = f([x_i]_t) + \Big( - \widehat{f}([x_i]_t) + \frac{1}{2}(\overline{[x_i]}_t + \underline{[x_i]}_t)\Big) + [w_i]_t, \tag{25}$$

which coincides with the closed loop dynamics for scalar system presented in [33]. Therefore, quoting the results in [33] we immediately know if $L < 3/2 + \sqrt{2}$ then

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \big|[x_i]_t\big| < \infty,\ i \in \mathrm{V},$$

or equivalently, $\limsup\limits_{t\to\infty} |\mathbf{x}_i(t)| < \infty$ and the network dynamics have been stabilized.

### 4.3 Local Feedback with Local Flow

We now present a local-flow/local-decision feedback law that will enable us to prove Theorem 4.

[**Estimator**] Fix $i \in \mathrm{V}$. For $j \in \mathrm{N}_i$ and $t \ge 1$, there exist $[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t \in \mathrm{V}$ and $0 \le [s_{ij}]_t \le t-1$ that satisfy

$$\mathbf{x}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t) \in \arg\min\nolimits_{\mathbf{x}_k(s)} \Big\{ |\mathbf{x}_j(t) - \mathbf{x}_k(s)| : k \in \mathrm{N}_i \cup \{i\}, s \in [0, t-1] \Big\}. \tag{26}$$

We define an estimator at node $i$ for $f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)), j \in \mathrm{N}_i$ at time $t$ by

$$\widehat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) = \mathbf{z}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t). \tag{27}$$

[**Feedback**] Let $\mathbf{u}_i(0) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$. Then for all $t \ge 1$ and all $i \in \mathrm{V}$, we let

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = -\sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} \widehat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \mathbf{x}_i(0). \tag{28}$$

It is also clear that Eq. (27)–(28) form a distributed controller with local information under Definition 4.

### 4.4 Local Feedback with Max-Consensus-Enhanced Local Flow

Let $i \in \mathrm{V}$ and $t \ge 1$. We denote

$$\mathcal{X}_i(t) = \Big\{ \overline{\mathbf{x}}(s) : 0 \le s \le t-1 \Big\} \cup \Big\{ \underline{\mathbf{x}}(s) : 0 \le s \le t-1 \Big\} \cup \Big\{ \mathbf{x}_j(s) : j \in \mathrm{N}_i \cup \{i\}, 0 \le s \le t-1 \Big\}$$

as the set of states whose estimated data under function $f$ can be accessible to node $i$ at time $t$. We define a function $\mathcal{K}_i^t(\cdot)$ over $\mathcal{X}_i(t)$ by

$$\mathcal{K}_i^t(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_j(s), & \text{if } x = \mathbf{x}_j(s),\ j \in \mathrm{N}_i \cup \{i\},\ 0 \le s \le t-1; \\ \overline{\mathbf{z}}(s), & \text{if } x = \overline{\mathbf{x}}(s),\ 0 \le s \le t-1; \\ \underline{\mathbf{z}}(s), & \text{if } x = \underline{\mathbf{x}}(s),\ 0 \le s \le t-1. \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

[**Estimator**] Let node $i$ estimate $f(\mathbf{x}_j(t))$ for $j \in \mathrm{N}_i \cup \{i\}$ at time $t$ by

$$\widehat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) = \mathcal{K}_i^t\Big(\arg\min\nolimits_{x \in \mathcal{X}_i(t)} \big\{|\mathbf{x}_j(t) - x|\big\}\Big). \tag{30}$$

[**Feedback**] Let $\mathbf{u}_i(0) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$. Then for all $t \ge 1$ and all $i \in \mathrm{V}$, we let

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = -\sum_{j \in \mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} \widehat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \frac{1}{2}(\overline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t)). \tag{31}$$

Eq. (30)-(31) form a Max-Consensus-Enhanced-Local-Flow/Local-Decision controller satisfying Definition 6.

# 5 Proofs of Statements

In this section, we prove all the claimed stabilizability theorems.

## 5.1 Proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 3

The sufficiency and necessity of the statements in Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 will be proved, respectively, after some helpful technical preparations have been made.

### 5.1.1 Preliminary Lemmas

We first present a few useful lemmas which turn out incremental for the sufficiency proof, starting from the following technical lemma regarding two real sequences.

**Lemma 2** *Let $0 < M < 3/2 + \sqrt{2}$, $t_0 \ge 0, \rho \ge 0$ and $\omega$ be any constant. Suppose two nonnegative sequences $\langle p_t \rangle_{t \ge 0}$, $\langle q_t \rangle_{t \ge 0}$ satisfy for all $t \ge t_0$ that*

$$p_{t+1} \le \Big(M \max\{\max_{1 \le s \le t} p_s, \max_{1 \le s \le t} q_s, \rho\} - \frac{1}{2}\rho - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t}(p_s + q_s) + \omega\Big)^+ \tag{32}$$

$$q_{t+1} \le \Big(M \max\{\max_{1 \le s \le t} p_s, \max_{1 \le s \le t} q_s, \rho\} - \frac{1}{2}\rho - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t}(p_s + q_s) + \omega\Big)^+. \tag{33}$$

*Then there holds*

$$\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}(p_s + q_s) < \infty.$$

*Proof.* We prove the conclusion by contradiction. Assume for the rest of the proof that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\sum_{s=1}^{t}(p_s+q_s)=\infty. \tag{34}$$

We divide the argument into a few steps.

*Step 1:* In this step, we prove that for any $t>t_0$, it must hold

$$M\max\{\max_{1\le s\le t}p_s,\max_{1\le s\le t}q_s,\rho\}-\frac{1}{2}\rho-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t}(p_s+q_s)+\omega>0. \tag{35}$$

Let there otherwise exist $t_1>t_0$ such that

$$M\max\{\max_{1\le s\le t_1}p_s,\max_{1\le s\le t_1}q_s,\rho\}-\frac{1}{2}\rho-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t_1}(p_s+q_s)+\omega\le 0.$$

From (32) and (33), we immediately know $p_{t_1+1}=0$ and $q_{t_1+1}=0$. This further implies $p_t=0$ and $q_t=0$ for $t>t_1$, which contradicts (34). Therefore, (35) holds for all $t>t_0$.

*Step 2:* From (35), (32) and (33) can be written as

$$p_{t+1}\le M\max\{\max_{1\le s\le t}p_s,\max_{1\le s\le t}q_s,\rho\}-\frac{1}{2}\rho-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t}(p_s+q_s)+\omega, \tag{36}$$

$$q_{t+1}\le M\max\{\max_{1\le s\le t}p_s,\max_{1\le s\le t}q_s,\rho\}-\frac{1}{2}\rho-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t}(p_s+q_s)+\omega. \tag{37}$$

Introduce $\langle r_t\rangle_{t\ge 0}$ with $r_0=\rho$ and $r_t=\max\{p_t,q_t\}$ for $t\ge 1$. There holds for $\langle r_t\rangle$ from (36) and (37) that

$$r_{t+1}\le M\max_{0\le s\le t}r_s-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=0}^{t}r_s+\omega. \tag{38}$$

In this step, we construct a subsequence $\langle r_{t_m}\rangle_{m\ge 0}$ of $\langle r_t\rangle_{t\ge 0}$ with even simpler recursion.

Note that, according to (34) and (36), one has

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\max\{\max_{1\le s\le t}p_s,\max_{1\le s\le t}q_s,\rho\}=\infty,$$

which yields from the definition of $\langle r_t\rangle$ that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\max_{0\le s\le t}r_s=\infty.$$

Thus, there exist subsequence $\langle r_{t_m}\rangle_{m\ge 0}$ of $\langle r_t\rangle_{t\ge 0}$ with $r_{t_{m+1}}>r_{t_m}$, such that for $t_m\le t<t_{m+1}$, there holds $r_t\le r_{t_m}$. As a result, one has $\max_{0\le s\le t_{m+1}-1}r_s=r_{t_m}$, and further

$$r_{t_{m+1}}\le Mr_{t_m}-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=0}^{t_{m+1}-1}r_s+\omega\le Mr_{t_m}-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=0}^{m}r_{t_j}+\omega. \tag{39}$$

*Step 3:* This step will conclude the final argument.

Define $R_m = \sum_{j=0}^{m} r_{t_j}$ for $m \geq 0$, which satisfies $R_{m+1} > R_m$ and $\lim_{m\to\infty} R_m = \infty$. Replacing $r_{t_k}$ by $R_k - R_{k-1}$ for $k = m, m+1$ in (39), we arrive at

$$R_{m+1} \leq M(R_m - R_{m-1}) + R_m/2 + \omega, \quad m \geq 0, \tag{40}$$

leading to

$$\xi_{m+1} \leq M(1 - \xi_m^{-1}) + 1/2 + \omega/R_m, m \geq 1 \tag{41}$$

where $\xi_m = R_m/R_{m-1}$. Letting $m \to \infty$ in (41) with $\xi := \liminf_{m\to\infty} \xi_m \geq 1$ results in

$$\xi \leq M(1 - 1/\xi) + 1/2.$$

Obviously $\xi \neq 1$ and therefore

$$M \geq \frac{\xi^2 - \xi/2}{\xi - 1} \geq \inf_{\xi>1} \frac{\xi^2 - \xi/2}{\xi - 1} = 3/2 + \sqrt{2}.$$

We have now obtain a contradiction and the desired lemma holds. □

Let $\mathcal{I}_t := [\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t), \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)]$ be the minimal interval containing all node states up to time $t \geq 1$, and then for $t \geq 1$ introduce $\mathcal{R}_t = (\overline{\mathbf{y}}(t-1), \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)]$, $\mathcal{L}_t = [\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t), \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t-1))$. The length of these intervals is denoted as $|\mathcal{I}_t| = \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t) - \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t)$, $|\mathcal{R}_t| = \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t) - \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t-1)$, and $|\mathcal{L}_t| = \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t-1) - \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t)$, respectively. It is easy to observe that $\mathcal{I}_0$, $\mathcal{R}_s$, $\mathcal{L}_s$, $s = 1, \ldots, t$, are disjoint sets with

$$\mathcal{I}_t = \mathcal{I}_0 \bigcup \Big( \bigcup_{s=1}^{t} \mathcal{R}_s \Big) \bigcup \Big( \bigcup_{s=1}^{t} \mathcal{L}_s \Big). \tag{42}$$

The following lemma holds.

**Lemma 3** *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ and consider the closed loop dynamics of the system (1) with controller (19)-(20). Let there exist some $k \in \mathrm{V}$ at time $t$ such that $|\mathbf{x}_k(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_k]_t}([s_k]_t)| > \epsilon$. Then for any $\eta > 0$, there exists $E_* \geq 0$ such that the $\big\langle |\mathcal{R}_t| \big\rangle_{t\geq 1}$ and $\big\langle |\mathcal{L}_t| \big\rangle_{t\geq 1}$ satisfy recursion*

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{R}_{t+1}| &\leq \Big( \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty (L+\eta) \max\{ \max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{R}_s|, \max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{L}_s|, |\mathcal{I}_0| \} - \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{I}_0| - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t} (|\mathcal{R}_s| + |\mathcal{L}_s|) + E_* \Big)^+ \\
|\mathcal{L}_{t+1}| &\leq \Big( \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty (L+\eta) \max\{ \max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{R}_s|, \max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{L}_s|, |\mathcal{I}_0| \} - \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{I}_0| - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t} (|\mathcal{R}_s| + |\mathcal{L}_s|) + E_* \Big)^+.
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

*Proof.* First of all, we establish an unconditional upper bound for $|\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t)|$. From (42) there holds

$$|\mathcal{I}_t| = |\mathcal{I}_0| + \sum_{s=1}^{t} (|\mathcal{R}_s| + |\mathcal{L}_s|). \tag{44}$$

We investigate two cases, respectively.

(i) Let $\mathbf{x}_i(t) \notin \mathcal{I}_{t-1}$. Then obviously there holds $|\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t)| \leq \max\{|\mathcal{R}_t|, |\mathcal{L}_t|\}$.

(ii) Let $\mathbf{x}_i(t) \in \mathcal{I}_{t-1}$. Then by (42), $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ must be contained in some $\mathcal{R}_s$, $\mathcal{L}_s$ or $\mathcal{I}_0$, giving

$$|\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t)| \leq \max\{\max_{1\leq s\leq t-1} |\mathcal{R}_s|, \max_{1\leq s\leq t-1} |\mathcal{L}_s|, |\mathcal{I}_0|\}.$$

Combining the two cases allows to conclude

$$|\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t)| \leq \max\{\max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{R}_s|, \max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{L}_s|, |\mathcal{I}_0|\} \tag{45}$$

for all $t \geq 1$.

Next, fix any $\eta > 0$ and let $c$ be given in Lemma 1 since $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$. The definition of $|\mathcal{R}_{t+1}|$ implies

$$\begin{cases} |\mathcal{R}_{t+1}| = 0, & \text{if } \max_{1\leq i\leq n} \mathbf{x}_i(t+1) \leq \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t), \\ |\mathcal{R}_{t+1}| = [\max_{1\leq i\leq n} \mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))] - \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{I}_t|, & \text{if } \max_{1\leq i\leq n} \mathbf{x}_i(t+1) > \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t). \end{cases}$$

This allows us to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_{t+1}| &= \max\{\max_{1\leq i\leq n} \mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)) - \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{I}_t|, 0\} \\ &= \Big(\max_{1\leq i\leq n} \mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)) - \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{I}_t|\Big)^+ \\ &\leq \Big(\max_{1\leq i\leq n} |\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))| - \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{I}_t|\Big)^+ \\ &\leq \Big(\max_{1\leq i\leq n} |\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))| - \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{I}_0| - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t}(|\mathcal{R}_s| + |\mathcal{L}_s|)\Big)^+, \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where the last inequality is from (44).

Finally, plugging the controller (19)-(20) in the network dynamics, we obtain for the closed loop system that

$$\begin{aligned} &\big|\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))\big| \\ &= \Big|\sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \mathbf{u}_i(t) + \mathbf{w}_i(t) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))\Big| \\ &= \Big|\sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) - \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij}\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \mathbf{w}_i(t)\Big| \\ &\leq \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}|\Big(\Big|f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) - f(\mathbf{x}_{[v_j]_t}([s_j]_t))\Big| + \Big|f(\mathbf{x}_{[v_j]_t}([s_j]_t)) - \mathbf{z}_{[v_j]_t}([s_j]_t)\Big|\Big) + w_* \\ &\leq \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}| \cdot \Big|f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) - f(\mathbf{x}_{[v_j]_t}([s_j]_t))\Big| + D_0\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty + w_*. \\ &\leq \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty(L+\eta)\max\big\{\max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{R}_s|, \max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{L}_s|, |\mathcal{I}_0|\big\} + E_*, \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where $E_* = (c + D_0)\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty + w_*$, in the second inequality we have used (2), and the last inequality is derived by (8) and (45). Combining(46) and (47) eventually gives us

$$|\mathcal{R}_{t+1}| \leq \Big(\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty(L+\eta)\max\{\max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{R}_s|, \max_{1\leq s\leq t} |\mathcal{L}_s|, |\mathcal{I}_0|\} - \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{I}_0| - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=1}^{t}(|\mathcal{R}_s| + |\mathcal{L}_s|) + E_*\Big)^+. \tag{48}$$

The inequality about $|\mathcal{L}_{t+1}|$ can be established using a symmetric analysis. This concludes the proof of the desired lemma. □

### 5.1.2 Proof of Sufficiency

We are now in a place to prove the sufficiency part of Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 by showing the controller presented in Section 4.1 stabilizes the network dynamics.

Fix any $\eta > 0$ with $L + \eta < \big(3/2 + \sqrt{2}\big)/\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty$. Let $c$ be given in Lemma 1. The proof is organized into a few steps.

*Step 1:* In this step, we prove the following claim.

Claim. For any $s_0 > 0$, there exists $\tau > s_0$ such that $|\mathbf{x}_i(\tau) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_\tau}([s_i]_\tau)| \leq \epsilon$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$.

Fix $t_0 > 0$. Suppose for any $t > t_0$, there exists $k \in \mathrm{V}$ (which is dependent on $t$) such that $|\mathbf{x}_k(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_k]_t}([s_k]_t)| > \epsilon$. Lemma 3 implies that (43) holds for all $t > t_0$, leading to $\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}(|\mathcal{R}_s| + |\mathcal{L}_s|) < \infty$ if we invoke Lemma 2. This further enforces the sequences $\langle \mathbf{x}_i(t)\rangle_{t\geq 0}$ to be bounded for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$, which yields

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} |\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t)| = 0.$$

As a result, there however must hold with a large $t$ that $|\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t)| \leq \epsilon$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$. Therefore, for any $t_0 > 0$, we can find $\tau > t_0$ such that $|\mathbf{x}_i(\tau) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_\tau}([s_i]_\tau)| \leq \epsilon$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$. This proves the desired claim.

*Step 2:* In this step, we prove that the sequence $\langle \mathbf{x}_i(t)\rangle_{t\geq 0}$ is bounded for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$. Fix an arbitrary $s_0$ and let $\tau(s_0) > s_0$ be the time instant in the above claim. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{x}_i(\tau+1)| &= \Big| \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} f(\mathbf{x}_j(\tau)) + \mathbf{u}_i(\tau) + \mathbf{w}_i(\tau)\Big| \\
&= \Big| \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} f(\mathbf{x}_j(\tau)) - \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij}\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_j(\tau)) + \mathbf{w}_i(\tau)\Big| \\
&\leq \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}|\Big(\Big|f(\mathbf{x}_j(\tau)) - f(\mathbf{x}_{[v_j]_\tau}([s_j]_\tau))\Big| + \Big|f(\mathbf{x}_{[v_j]_\tau}([s_j]_\tau)) - \mathbf{z}_{[v_j]_\tau}([s_j]_\tau)\Big|\Big) + w_* \\
&\leq \|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty(L+\eta)\epsilon + (c + D_0)\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty + w_* \qquad (49)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$.

Therefore, choosing $s_0 = 0$ we can define

$$t_0 := \inf\Big\{t > 0 : |\mathbf{x}_i(t)| \leq \|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty(L+\eta)\epsilon + (c+D_0)\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty + w_*,\ \forall i \in \mathrm{V}\Big\}.$$

Moreover, we can continue to recursively define

$$t_m := \inf\Big\{t > t_{m-1} : |\mathbf{x}_i(t)| \leq \|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty(L+\eta)\epsilon + (c+D_0)\|A_{\rm G}\|_\infty + w_*,\ \forall i \in \mathrm{V}\Big\}.$$

This procedure yields bounded sequences $\langle \mathbf{x}_i(t_m)\rangle_{m\geq 0}$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$, and as a result,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\Big|\mathbf{x}_i(t_m) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_{t_m}}([s_i]_{t_m})\Big| = 0,\ i \in \mathrm{V}.$$

In other words, there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$|\mathbf{x}_i(t_m) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_{t_m}}([s_i]_{t_m})| \leq \epsilon.$$

for $m > M$ and for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$.

However, applying the upper bound in (49) by replacing $\tau$ with $t_m$, we know for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$,

$$|\mathbf{x}_i(t_m + 1)| \leq \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty (L + \eta)\epsilon + (c + D_0)\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty + w_*. \tag{50}$$

By the definition of the $\langle t_m \rangle_{m \geq 0}$ (50) ensures $t_{m+1} = t_m + 1$ be the only possibility for $m > M$. This means that we have proved for $t > t_{M+1}$ and all $i \in \mathrm{V}$ that

$$|\mathbf{x}_i(t)| \leq \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty (L + \eta)\epsilon + (c + D_0)\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty + w_*.$$

*Step 3:* In this step, we further optimize the upper bound of the node states. Note that the sequences $\langle \mathbf{x}_i(t) \rangle_{t \geq 0}$, $i \in \mathrm{V}$ are bounded, elementary properties for bounded real sequences give us

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} |\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t)| = 0.$$

Thus, for any $\epsilon_* < \epsilon$, there exists $s_*$ such that for $t > s_*$ and all $i \in \mathrm{V}$,

$$|\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[v_i]_t}([s_i]_t)| \leq \epsilon_*.$$

By the same method as we establish (49), we further have

$$|\mathbf{x}_i(t + 1)| \leq \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty (L + \eta)\epsilon_* + (c + D_0)\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty + w_*, \quad t > s_*, i \in \mathrm{V} \tag{51}$$

As $\epsilon_*$ can be arbitrarily small, (51) guarantees

$$\limsup_{t \to \infty} |\mathbf{x}_i(t)| \leq (c + D_0)\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty + w_*$$

for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$. This upper bound holds for any $c$ given in Lemma 1 associated with $\eta > 0$ satisfying $L + \eta < \big(3/2 + \sqrt{2}\big)/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty$. By the definition of $\mathfrak{M}(\cdot)$, we can further tighten the bound by

$$\limsup_{t \to \infty} |\mathbf{x}_i(t)| \leq \Big(\mathfrak{W}_f\big(3/2 + \sqrt{2}\big)/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty\big) + D_0\Big)\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty + w_*, \ \forall i \in \mathrm{V}.$$

We have now proved the sufficiency statements in Theorem 1 and Theorem 3.

### 5.1.3 Proof of Necessity

Let $L \geq (3/2 + \sqrt{2})/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty$ and fix an arbitrary global-knowledge/global-decision feedback law (3). Fix an initial value $\mathbf{X}(0)$. We continue to construct an interaction graph G and a function $f_* \in \mathcal{F}_L$ under which the network dynamics diverge in the sense that

$$\limsup_{t \to \infty} \max_{i \in \mathrm{V}} |\mathbf{x}_i(t)| = \infty.$$




Figure 4: An $n$-node network with only one self link.

The graph we constructed is a simple $n$-node network with only one self link at node 1 with weight $a_{11}$ (see Fig. 4). Therefore $\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty = |a_{11}|$ and the network dynamics read as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_1(t+1) &= a_{11} f(\mathbf{x}_1(t)) + \mathbf{w}_1(t) + \mathbf{u}_1(t) \\ \mathbf{x}_2(t+1) &= \mathbf{w}_2(t) + \mathbf{u}_2(t) \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_n(t+1) &= \mathbf{w}_n(t) + \mathbf{u}_n(t). \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Note that, the trajectories of $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$, $t = 2, \ldots, n$ are by themselves stable with zero inputs, and they contain no information about $f(\cdot)$ regardless of the choice of the $\mathbf{u}_i(t)$ for $t = 2, \ldots, n$. Therefore, stabilizability of the above network dynamics is equivalent with stabilizability of the dynamics of node 1:

$$\mathbf{x}_1(t+1) = a_{11} f(\mathbf{x}_1(t)) + \mathbf{w}_1(t) + \mathbf{u}_1(t). \tag{53}$$

This system is essentially the same as the scalar system investigated in [33] except for the known constant $a_{11}$. Invoking the necessity proof of Theorem 2.1 in [33], we easily know that for any feedback law $\mathbf{u}_1(t)$, we can find a function $f_* \in \mathcal{F}_L$ with

$$|a_{11}|L = \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty L = 3/2 + \sqrt{2}$$

under which the closed loop dynamics of (53) lead to

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} |\mathbf{x}_1(t)| = \infty.$$

We have now concluded the necessity proof of Theorem 1, and therefore the necessity proof of Theorem 3 as well.

## 5.2 Proof of Theorem 2

### 5.2.1 Preliminaries

Before presenting the main body of the proof we introduce a set of useful concepts and notations.

**Definition 7** *A continuous function* $\mathrm{h} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *is said to be piecewise linear with slope* $\pm B$*, if there exists a increasing sequence* $\langle y_n \rangle_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$ *with* $\lim_{n\to\infty} y_n = \overline{y} \leq \infty$ *and* $\lim_{n\to-\infty} y_n = \underline{y} \geq -\infty$*, such that* h *is linear on* $(-\infty, \underline{y}]$*,* $[y_n, y_{n+1}]$ *and* $[\overline{y}, +\infty)$ *with slope* $B$ *or* $-B$ *for any* $n \in \mathbb{Z}$*.*

We denote the set of all piecewise linear functions with slope $\pm B$ as $\mathcal{H}_B^*$. It is easy to verify that for any $\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}_B^*$ and any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|\mathrm{h}(x) - \mathrm{h}(y)| \leq B|x - y|.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{H}_B^* \subset \mathcal{F}_B$ for all $B > 0$.

We continue to use the notion of intervals $\mathcal{I}_t$, $\mathcal{R}_t$, and $\mathcal{L}_t$ as defined in the previous proof. Moreover, for any $t \geq 0$, there exist $[\overline{i}]_t \in \mathrm{V}$ and $0 \leq [\overline{s}]_t \leq t$ that satisfy $\mathbf{x}_{[\overline{i}]_t}([\overline{s}]_t) = \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)$, and $[\underline{i}]_t \in \mathrm{V}$ and $0 \leq [\underline{s}]_t \leq t$ that satisfy $\mathbf{x}_{[\underline{i}]_t}([\underline{s}]_t) = \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t)$. Let $\theta_0 = [\overline{i}]_0$ and for any $t \geq 1$, $\theta_t = [\overline{i}]_t$ if $|\mathcal{R}_t| \geq |\mathcal{L}_t|$, $\theta_t = [\underline{i}]_t$ otherwise. Since the graph G is strongly connected, we associate with $\theta_t \in \mathrm{V}$ an arbitrary node $d_t \in \mathrm{V}$ that satisfies $(\theta_t, d_t) \in \mathrm{E}$, i.e., $\theta_t$ is a neighbor of $d_t$. We also introduce

$$\chi(t) = \max\{|\mathcal{R}_t|, |\mathcal{L}_t|\}, \tag{54}$$

which satisfies trivially from the network dynamics and the definition of $\mathcal{I}(t)$ that

$$\chi(t+1) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{x}_i(t+1), \mathcal{I}_t) = \mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{x}_{\theta_{t+1}}([\overline{s}]_{t+1}), \mathcal{I}_t), \tag{55}$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

### 5.2.2 Construction of the Function

Let the underlying graph G be strongly connected. Assume either $[A_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathrm{V}$ or $[A_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij} \leq 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathrm{V}$. Fix the initial value $\mathbf{X}(0)$, the global-knowledge/global-decision feedback law $\mathbf{U}(t)$, and the noise function $\mathbf{W}(t)$. We proceed to construct a function $f \in \mathcal{F}_L$ with $L = 4/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp$ under which the closed-loop network dynamics will asymptotically diverge. To this end, we first recursively define a serial of function sets.

Denote $\mathcal{H}^* := \mathcal{H}_B^*$ with $B = 4/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp$ as the set of piecewise linear functions with slop $4/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp$. As mentioned above we have $\mathcal{H}^* \subseteq \mathcal{F}_L$ with $L = 4/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp$.

*Step 1:* In this step, we define a set of functions on $\mathbb{R}$ that they have common values on interval $\mathcal{I}_0$. Denote $\alpha_0 = \underline{\mathbf{y}}(0)$ and $\alpha_1 = \overline{\mathbf{y}}(0)$, and introduce

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^0 = \big\{\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^* : \mathrm{h}(\alpha_0) = 1, \mathrm{h}(\alpha_1) = 1 + 4|\mathcal{I}_0|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp\big\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{n}}^0 = \big\{\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^* : \mathrm{h}(\alpha_0) = -1, \mathrm{h}(\alpha_1) = -1 - 4|\mathcal{I}_0|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp\big\}.$$

Both sets are nonempty. We define

$$\mathcal{H}^0 = \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^0, & \text{if } \mathrm{dist}\Big(\sum\limits_{j \in \mathrm{N}_{d_0}} a_{d_0 j} \mathrm{g}_0(\mathbf{x}_j(0)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_0}(0) + \mathbf{w}_{d_0}(0), (\underline{\mathbf{y}}(0) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(0))/2\Big) \geq \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp + 4|\mathcal{I}_0|, \\ \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{n}}^0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{56}$$

where $\mathrm{g}_0$ is any function in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^0$.

*Step 2:* In this step, we define a subset of $\mathcal{H}^0$ that the functions in it hold common values on interval $\mathcal{I}_1$. By the definition of $\mathcal{H}^0$, for any $\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^0$, $\mathbf{X}(1)$ holds the same value. As will be shown later in the divergence proof, there holds $\mathbf{x}_{d_0}(1) \notin \mathcal{I}_0$. Thus, $\mathbf{x}_{\theta_1}([\overline{s}]_1) \notin \mathcal{I}_0$ and $[\overline{s}]_1 = 1$. Let $\alpha_2 = \overline{\mathbf{y}}(1)$ and $\alpha_{-1} = \underline{\mathbf{y}}(1)$. We define

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^1 = \big\{\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^0 : \mathrm{h}(\alpha_2) = \mathrm{h}(\alpha_1) + 4|\mathcal{R}_1|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp \text{ and } \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{-1}) = \mathrm{h}(\alpha_0) + 4|\mathcal{L}_1|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp\big\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{n}}^1 = \big\{\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^0 : \mathrm{h}(\alpha_2) = \mathrm{h}(\alpha_1) - 4|\mathcal{R}_1|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp \text{ and } \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{-1}) = \mathrm{h}(\alpha_0) - 4|\mathcal{L}_1|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp\big\}.$$

Again the two sets are both nonempty. Introduce

$$\mathcal{H}^1 = \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^1, & \text{if } \mathrm{dist}\Big(\sum\limits_{j\in\mathrm{N}_{d_1}} a_{d_1 j}\mathrm{g}_1(\mathbf{x}_j(1)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_1}(1) + \mathbf{w}_{d_1}(1), (\underline{\mathbf{y}}(1) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(1))/2\Big) \geq 4\chi(1), \\ \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{n}}^1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{57}$$

where $\mathrm{g}_1$ is any function in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^1$.

*Step 3:* In this step, we recursively define the set of functions on $\mathbb{R}$ which take common values on interval $\mathcal{I}_t$. For any $t \geq 2$ and any $\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^{t-1}$, $\mathbf{X}(t)$ holds the same value. There holds that $\mathbf{x}_{d_{t-1}}(t) \notin \mathcal{I}_{t-1}$, whose proof is deferred to the part of divergence analysis. Thus, $\mathbf{x}_{\theta_t}([\overline{s}]_t) \notin \mathcal{I}_{t-1}$ and $[\overline{s}]_t = t$. Let $\alpha_{t+1} = \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)$ and $\alpha_{-t} = \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t)$. Define

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^t = \big\{\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^{t-1} : \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{t+1}) = \mathrm{h}(\alpha_t) + 4|\mathcal{R}_t|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp \text{ and } \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{-t}) = \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{-t+1}) + 4|\mathcal{L}_t|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp\big\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{n}}^t = \big\{\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^{t-1} : \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{t+1}) = \mathrm{h}(\alpha_t) - 4|\mathcal{R}_t|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp \text{ and } \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{-t}) = \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{-t+1}) - 4|\mathcal{L}_t|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp\big\}.$$

It is easy to verify they are nonempty sets and further let

$$\mathcal{H}^t = \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^t, & \text{if } \mathrm{dist}\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_{d_t}} a_{d_t j}\mathrm{g}_t(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_t}(t) + \mathbf{w}_{d_t}(t), (\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))/2\Big) \geq 4\chi(t), \\ \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{n}}^t, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{58}$$

where $\mathrm{g}_t$ is any function in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^t$.

Finally, the sequence of functions $\mathcal{H}^t$ specifies an increasing sequence of real numbers $\big\langle\alpha_t\big\rangle_{t=-\infty}^{\infty}$. Let

$$\mathcal{H}^\infty = \big\{\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^* : \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{t+1}) = \mathrm{h}_t(\alpha_{t+1}) \text{ and } \mathrm{h}(\alpha_{-t}) = \mathrm{h}_t(\alpha_{-t}) \text{ for any } \mathrm{h}_t \in \mathcal{H}^t, t = 0, 1, \dots\big\} \tag{59}$$

which is certainly not empty. For any given $f \in \mathcal{H}^\infty$, as will be shown later, the given feedback law $\mathbf{U}(t)$ will not be able stabilize the network dynamics (1).

### 5.2.3 Proof of Divergence

We now prove that the feedback law $\mathbf{U}(t)$ with the network dynamics (1) will drive the network dynamics to diverge for any $f_* \in \mathcal{H}^\infty$. Our argument is organized in steps as usual.

*Step 1:* We first investigate the network state for $t = 1$. Based on the definition of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^0$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{n}}^0$, we know for any $\mathrm{g}_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^0$ and $\mathrm{h}_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{n}}^0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{dist}\Big( \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_0}} a_{d_0 j} \mathrm{g}_0(\mathbf{x}_j(0)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_0}(0) + \mathbf{w}_{d_0}(0), \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_0}} a_{d_0 j} \mathrm{h}_0(\mathbf{x}_j(0)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_0}(0) + \mathbf{w}_{d_0}(0) \Big) \\
&= \Big| \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_0}} a_{d_0 j} (\mathrm{g}_0(\mathbf{x}_j(0)) - \mathrm{h}_0(\mathbf{x}_j(0))) \Big| \\
&= \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_0}} |a_{d_0 j}| \cdot \Big| \mathrm{g}_0(\mathbf{x}_j(0)) - \mathrm{h}_0(\mathbf{x}_j(0)) \Big| \\
&\geq |a_{d_0 \theta_0}| \cdot \Big| \mathrm{g}_0(\mathbf{x}_{\theta_0}(0)) - \mathrm{h}_0(\mathbf{x}_{\theta_0}(0)) \Big| \\
&\geq \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp (2 + 8|\mathcal{I}_0|/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp) \\
&= 2\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp + 8|\mathcal{I}_0|,
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where the second equality holds due to the fact that all $a_{ij}$ have the same sign for $(i, j) \in \mathrm{E}$. Thus, for any $\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^0$,

$$\mathrm{dist}\Big( \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_0}} a_{d_0 j} \mathrm{h}(\mathbf{x}_j(0)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_0}(0) + \mathbf{w}_{d_0}(0), \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(0) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(0)) \Big) \geq \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp + 4|\mathcal{I}_0|. \tag{61}$$

Now that

$$\mathbf{x}_{d_0}(1) = \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_0}} a_{d_0 j} f_*(\mathbf{x}_j(0)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_0}(0) + \mathbf{w}_{d_0}(t)$$

we know

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi(1) &= \mathrm{dist}\big((\mathbf{x}_{\theta_1}([\overline{s}]_1), \mathcal{I}_0\big) \\
&\geq \mathrm{dist}\big((\mathbf{x}_{d_0}(1), \mathcal{I}_0\big) \\
&\geq \mathrm{dist}\big(\mathbf{x}_{d_0}(1), (\underline{\mathbf{y}}(0) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(0))/2\big) - |\mathcal{I}_0|/2 \\
&= \mathrm{dist}\Big( \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_0}} a_{d_0 j} f_*(\mathbf{x}_j(0)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_0}(0) + \mathbf{w}_{d_0}(t), \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(0) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(0)) \Big) - |\mathcal{I}_0|/2 \\
&\geq \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\sharp + 7|\mathcal{I}_0|/2
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

according to (55) and (61) as $f_*$ coincides with h on $\mathcal{I}_0$. This also indicate that $\mathbf{x}_{d_0}(1) \notin \mathcal{I}_0$.

*Step 2:* Next, we investigate the case with $t = 2$ and reveal the recursion pattern. For any $\mathrm{g}_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{p}}^1$ and

$\mathrm{h}_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{n}}^1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{dist}\Big(\sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_1}} a_{d_1 j}\mathrm{g}_1(\mathbf{x}_j(1)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_1}(1) + \mathbf{w}_{d_1}(1), \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_1}} a_{d_1 j}\mathrm{h}_1(\mathbf{x}_j(1)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_1}(1) + \mathbf{w}_{d_1}(1)\Big)\\
&= \Big|\sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_1}} a_{d_1 j}(\mathrm{g}_1(\mathbf{x}_j(1)) - \mathrm{h}_1(\mathbf{x}_j(1)))\Big|\\
&= \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_1}} |a_{d_1 j}| \cdot \Big|\mathrm{g}_1(\mathbf{x}_j(1)) - \mathrm{h}_1(\mathbf{x}_j(1))\Big|\\
&\geq |a_{d_1\theta_1}| \cdot \big|\mathrm{g}_1(\mathbf{x}_{\theta_1}(1)) - \mathrm{h}_1(\mathbf{x}_{\theta_1}(1))\big|\\
&\geq 8\chi(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $\mathrm{h} \in \mathcal{H}^1$,

$$\operatorname{dist}\big(\sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_1}} a_{d_1 j}\mathrm{h}(\mathbf{x}_j(1)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_1}(1) + \mathbf{w}_{d_1}(1), \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(1) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(1))\big) \geq 4\chi(1). \tag{63}$$

With the network dynamics given by $f_*$, we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi(2) &= \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_{\theta_2}([\overline{s}]_2), \mathcal{I}_1)\\
&\geq \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_{d_1}(2), \mathcal{I}_1)\\
&\geq \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{x}_{d_1}(2), (\underline{\mathbf{y}}(1) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(1))/2) - |\mathcal{I}_1|/2\\
&\geq \operatorname{dist}\Big(\sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_1}} a_{d_1 j} f_*(\mathbf{x}_j(1)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_1}(1) + \mathbf{w}_{d_1}(1), (\underline{\mathbf{y}}(1) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(1))/2\Big) - |\mathcal{I}_1|/2\\
&\geq 4\chi(1) - (|\mathcal{I}_0| + |\mathcal{R}_1| + |\mathcal{L}_1|)/2\\
&\geq 4\chi(1) - |\mathcal{I}_0|/2 - \chi(1)\\
&= 3\chi(1) - |\mathcal{I}_0|/2,
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

which is greater than 0 indicating $\mathbf{x}_{d_1}(2) \notin \mathcal{I}_1$.

*Step 3:* Finally, we proceed the analysis recursively and then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi(t+1) &= \operatorname{dist}\big(\mathbf{x}_{\theta_{t+1}}([\overline{s}]_{t+1}), \mathcal{I}_t\big)\\
&\geq \operatorname{dist}\big(\mathbf{x}_{d_t}(t+1), \mathcal{I}_t\big)\\
&\geq \operatorname{dist}\big(\mathbf{x}_{d_t}(t+1), (\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))/2\big) - |\mathcal{I}_t|/2\\
&\geq \operatorname{dist}\Big(\sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_{d_t}} a_{d_t j} f_*(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \mathbf{u}_{d_t}(t) + \mathbf{w}_{d_t}(t), (\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) + \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))/2\Big) - |\mathcal{I}_t|/2\\
&\geq 4\chi(t) - \Big(|\mathcal{I}_0| + \sum_{s=1}^{t}\big(|\mathcal{R}_s| + |\mathcal{L}_s|\big)\Big)\\
&\geq 4\chi(t) - |\mathcal{I}_0|/2 - \sum_{s=1}^{t}\chi(s).
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Denote $E_0 = |\mathcal{I}_0|/2$ and $E_t = |\mathcal{I}_0|/2 + \sum_{s=1}^{t} \chi(s)$ for $t \geq 1$. Then (64) (65) can be written as

$$E_{t+1} - E_t \geq 4(E_t - E_{t-1}) - E_t,\ t \geq 1$$

or equivalently,

$$E_{t+1} - 2E_t \geq 2(E_t - 2E_{t-1}),\ t \geq 1.$$

Therefore,

$$E_{t+1} - 2E_t \geq 2^t(E_1 - 2E_0) = 2^t(\chi(1) - |\mathcal{I}_0|/2) > 0.$$

This implies $E_{t+1} > 2E_t$, which in turn leads to $\chi(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $\sum_{s=1}^{t} \chi(s) \to +\infty$ as time tends to infinity. The network dynamics therefore must diverge and we have concluded the proof of Theorem 2.

### 5.3 Proof of Theorem 4

For any $t \geq 0$, we define $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) := \max_{0\leq s\leq t} \mathbf{x}_i(s)$, $\underline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) := \min_{0\leq s\leq t} \mathbf{x}_j(s)$, and further $\mathcal{I}_t^i := [\underline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t), \overline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t)]$ as the minimal interval containing all node states of node $i$ up to time $t$. We define $\mathcal{R}_t^i := (\overline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t-1), \overline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t)]$ and $\mathcal{L}_t^i := [\underline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t), \underline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t-1))$. It is easy to observe that

$$\mathcal{I}_t^i = \{\mathbf{x}_i(0)\} \cup (\bigcup_{s=1}^{t} \mathcal{R}_s^i) \cup (\bigcup_{s=1}^{t} \mathcal{L}_t^i), \tag{66}$$

and $\mathcal{R}_s^i$, $\mathcal{L}_s^i$, $s = 1, \ldots, t$, are disjoint. Thus,

$$|\mathcal{I}_t^i| = \sum_{s=1}^{t} (|\mathcal{R}_s^i| + |\mathcal{L}_s^i|). \tag{67}$$

The proof is divided into a few steps.

*Step 1:* In this step, we give an estimation of the difference between $\mathbf{x}_j(t)$ and $\mathbf{x}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t)$.

If $\mathbf{x}_j(t) \notin \mathcal{I}_{t-1}^j$, $t \geq 1$,

$$|\mathbf{x}_j(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t)| \leq \max\{|\mathcal{R}_t^j|, |\mathcal{L}_t^j|\}.$$

If $\mathbf{x}_j(t) \in \mathcal{I}_{t-1}^j$, $t \geq 1$, by (66), $\mathbf{x}_j(t)$ is contained in some $\mathcal{R}_s^j$, $\mathcal{L}_s^j$ or equal to $\mathbf{x}_i(0)$. Then, we have

$$|\mathbf{x}_j(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t)| \leq \max\{|\mathcal{R}_s^j|, |\mathcal{L}_s^j|\} \text{ for some } s \leq t-1.$$

Therefore, for any $i \in \mathrm{V}$, $j \in \mathrm{N}_i$ and $t \geq 1$,

$$|\mathbf{x}_j(t) - \mathbf{x}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t)| \leq \max_{1\leq s\leq t} \{|\mathcal{R}_s^j|, |\mathcal{L}_s^j|\}. \tag{68}$$

*Step 2:* In this step, we find a recursive estimation of $\mathcal{R}_{t+1}^i$ and $\mathcal{L}_{t+1}^i$. We note for each $i \in \mathrm{V}$ that

$$\begin{cases} |\mathcal{R}_{t+1}^i| &= 0, & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_i(t+1) \leq \overline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t), \\ |\mathcal{R}_{t+1}^i| &= \mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \overline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t), & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_i(t+1) > \overline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t). \end{cases}$$

We can thus conclude

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{R}_{t+1}^i| &= \big(\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \overline{\mathbf{x}}_i(t)\big)^+ \\ &= \Big(\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \mathbf{x}_i(0) - \sum_{s=1}^{t} |\mathcal{R}_s^i|\Big)^+ \\ &\le \Big(|\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \mathbf{x}_i(0)| - \sum_{s=1}^{t} |\mathcal{R}_s^i|\Big)^+. \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

According to (1), (2) and (28),

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \mathbf{x}_i(0)| \\ &= |\sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \mathbf{u}_i(t) + \mathbf{w}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_i(0)| \\ &= |\sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) - \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} \mathbf{z}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t) + \mathbf{w}_i(t)| \\ &\le \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}| \Big( |f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) - f(\mathbf{x}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t)| + |f(\mathbf{x}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t) - \mathbf{z}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t)| \Big) + w_* \\ &\le \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}| \Big( |f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) - f(\mathbf{x}_{[\mathrm{v}_{ij}]_t}([s_{ij}]_t)| + D_0 \Big) + w_*. \\ &\le \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}| \big( (L+\eta) \max_{1\le s\le t} \{|\mathcal{R}_s^j|, |\mathcal{L}_s^j|\} + c + D_0 \big) + w_*, \\ &\le (L+\eta) \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} \big( |a_{ij}| \max_{1\le s\le t} \{|\mathcal{R}_s^j|, |\mathcal{L}_s^j|\} \big) + w_i, \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where $w_i = (c + D_0) \sum\limits_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}| + w_*$. The third inequality is derived from ( 68) and Lemma 1. Therefore, by (69) and (70) and choosing $\omega = \max\limits_{i\in \mathrm{V}} \omega_i$, we have

$$|\mathcal{R}_{t+1}^i| \le \Big( (L+\eta) \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} \big( |a_{ij}| \max_{1\le s\le t} \{|\mathcal{R}_s^j|, |\mathcal{L}_s^j|\} \big) + w - \sum_{s=1}^{t} |\mathcal{R}_s^i| \Big)^+. \tag{71}$$

Using the same method, we also have,

$$|\mathcal{L}_{t+1}^i| \le \Big( (L+\eta) \sum_{j\in \mathrm{N}_i} \big( |a_{ij}| \max_{1\le s\le t} \{|\mathcal{R}_s^j|, |\mathcal{L}_s^j|\} \big) + w - \sum_{s=1}^{t} |\mathcal{L}_s^i| \Big)^+. \tag{72}$$

*Step 3:* This step provides the final piece of the proof. By the definition of $\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\dagger$, we know that $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \big(\mathcal{R}_{t+1}^i + \mathcal{L}_{t+1}^i\big) < \infty$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$. This proves stabilization of the network dynamics and concludes the proof of the desired theorem.

### 5.4 Proof of Theorem 5

Recall that $\mathcal{I}_t := [\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t), \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)]$, $|\mathcal{I}_t| = \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t) - \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t)$, $\mathcal{R}_t = (\overline{\mathbf{y}}(t-1), \overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)]$, and $\mathcal{L}_t = [\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t), \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t-1))$. The Eq. (42) holds. By their definition there holds

$$\overline{\mathbf{y}}(t) = \max_{0\le s\le t} \overline{\mathbf{x}}(s), \quad \underline{\mathbf{y}}(t) = \min_{0\le s\le t} \underline{\mathbf{x}}(s).$$

Because all nodes know $\overline{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ and $\underline{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ before time $t+1$, they know $\overline{\mathbf{y}}(t)$ and $\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t)$ too.

For $j \in \mathrm{N}_i$, if $\mathbf{x}_j(t) \notin \mathcal{I}_{t-1}$, $t \geq 1$, we have

$$\Big|\mathbf{x}_j(t) - \arg\min_{x\in\mathcal{X}_i(t)}\big\{|\mathbf{x}_j(t)-x|\big\}\Big| \leq \max\{|\mathcal{R}_t|, |\mathcal{L}_t|\}.$$

If $\mathbf{x}_j(t) \in \mathcal{I}_{t-1}$, $t \geq 1$, by (42), $\mathbf{x}_j(t)$ is contained in some $\mathcal{R}_s$, $\mathcal{L}_s$ or $\mathcal{I}_0$. Thus,

$$\Big|\mathbf{x}_j(t) - \arg\min_{x\in\mathcal{X}_i(t)}\big\{|\mathbf{x}_j(t)-x|\big\}\Big| \leq \max\{|\mathcal{R}_s|, |\mathcal{L}_s|, |\mathcal{I}_0|\} \text{ for some } s \leq t-1.$$

Therefore, for $t \geq 1$,

$$\Big|\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \arg\min_{x\in\mathcal{X}_i(t)}\big\{|\mathbf{x}_j(t)-x|\big\}\Big| \leq \max\Big\{\max_{1\leq s\leq t}\{|\mathcal{R}_t|, |\mathcal{L}_t|\}, |\mathcal{I}_0|\Big\}. \tag{73}$$

Note that (46) is irrelevant to the controller, so they also hold in this case. According to (1), (2) and (31),

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t)+\overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))| \\
&= |\sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \mathbf{u}_i(t) + \mathbf{w}_i(t) - \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\mathbf{y}}(t)+\overline{\mathbf{y}}(t))| \\
&= |\sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij} f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) - \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} a_{ij}\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) + \mathbf{w}_i(t)| \\
&\leq \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}|\Big(\Big|f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) - f\Big(\arg\min_{x\in\mathcal{X}_i(t)}\big\{|\mathbf{x}_j(t)-x|\big\}\Big)\Big| \\
&\quad + \Big|f\Big(\arg\min_{x\in\mathcal{X}_i(t)}\big\{|\mathbf{x}_j(t)-x|\big\}\Big) - \mathcal{K}_i^t\Big(\arg\min_{x\in\mathcal{X}_i(t)}\big\{|\mathbf{x}_j(t)-x|\big\}\Big)\Big|\Big) + w_* \\
&\leq \sum_{j\in\mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}|\Big|f(\mathbf{x}_j(t)) - f\Big(\arg\min_{x\in\mathcal{X}_i(t)}\big\{|\mathbf{x}_j(t)-x|\big\}\Big)\Big| + D_0\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty + w_*. \\
&\leq \|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty(L+\eta)\max\{\max_{1\leq s\leq t}|\mathcal{R}_s|, \max_{1\leq s\leq t}|\mathcal{L}_s|, |\mathcal{I}_0|\} + E_*,
\end{aligned}$$

where $E_* = (c+D_0)\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty + w_*$. This is exactly (47). Therefore, Eq. (48) continues to hold. From here and by invoking Lemma 2, the desired theorem can be established.

# 6 Conclusions

This paper proposes a framework for studying the fundamental limitations of feedback mechanism in dealing with uncertainties over network systems. The study of maximum capability of feedback control was pioneered in Xie and Guo (2000) for simple scalar system with discrete-time dynamics. We have successfully extended such effort to a network setting, where nodes with unknown and nonlinear dynamics hold interconnections through a directed interaction graph. Using information structure and decision pattern as criteria, three classes of feedback laws over such networks were defined, under which critical or sufficient feedback capacities were established, respectively. These preliminary results reveal a promising

path towards clear descriptions of feedback capabilities over complex network systems, many important problems yet remain open.

First of all, the fundamental limitations established in the current work are for generic graphs. How a given structure influences feedback capacity over networks has not been answered and it is a challenging question. Next, the model under investigation assumes measurement and control at all nodes, therefore it is very interesting to ask the same feedback capacity questions when only a subset of nodes can be monitors of the information flow and another subset of nodes can be controlled as anchors [30, 32]. Finally, parametric network model as generalizations to the work of [34] and [37] would be intriguing because such a model will certainly yield a strong connection between distributed estimation and distributed control.

## Appendix. Positivity of $\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\dagger$

The positivity of $\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\dagger$ for nontrivial graphs is implied by the following lemma.

**Lemma 4** $\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\dagger \geq 1/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty$.

*Proof:* Introduce node set $\mathrm{V}_p^\infty = \big\{i \in \mathrm{V} : \sum_{s=1}^\infty p_s^i = \infty\big\}$ and $\mathrm{V}_q^\infty = \big\{i \in \mathrm{V} : \sum_{s=1}^\infty q_s^i = \infty\big\}$. Assume that $\mathrm{V}_p^\infty$ is nonempty. Let us suppose for the moment

$$\mathfrak{B}^* := \max\big\{p_s^j, q_s^j : 1 \leq s < \infty, j \in \mathrm{V}\big\}$$

is a finite number. Then there exists $t_1 > 0$ such that $\sum_{s=1}^t p_s^i > \omega + \mathfrak{B}^*$ for all $t > t_1$, $i \in \mathrm{V}_p^\infty$. Consequently, letting $M = 1/\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty$ in (13) we know for all $i \in \mathrm{V}_p^\infty$ and $t > t_1$ that

$$M \sum_{j \in \mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}| \max_{1 \leq s \leq t} \{p_s^j, q_s^j\} + \omega - \sum_{s=1}^t p_s^i \leq M\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty \mathfrak{B}^* + \omega - (\omega + \mathfrak{B}^*) = 0.$$

Therefore, $p_{t+1}^i = 0$ for $i \in \mathrm{V}_p^\infty$ and all $t > t_1$, implying $\sum_{s=1}^\infty p_s^i < \infty$. This is not possible and therefore $\mathfrak{B}^* = \infty$.

Note that, from the definition of $\mathrm{V}_p^\infty$ and $\mathrm{V}_q^\infty$, there must exist $C^* > \omega$ such that $\sum_{s=1}^\infty p_s^i < \mathfrak{C}^*$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V} \backslash \mathrm{V}_p^\infty$, and $\sum_{s=1}^\infty q_s^i < \mathfrak{C}^*$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V} \backslash \mathrm{V}_q^\infty$. We can also find $t_2 > 0$ such that when $t > t_2$, $\sum_{s=1}^t p_s^i > \mathfrak{C}^*$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}_p^\infty$ and $\sum_{s=1}^t q_s^i > \mathfrak{C}^*$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}_q^\infty$. We select $t_3 = t_2 + 1$ and define

$$\mathfrak{D}^* := \max\big\{p_s^j, q_s^j : 1 \leq s \leq t_3, j \in \mathrm{V}\big\}$$

which should be no less than $C^*$. Then, for $i \in \mathrm{V}_p^\infty$ there holds that

$$M \sum_{j \in \mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}| \max_{1 \leq s \leq t_3} \{p_s^j, q_s^j\} + \omega - \sum_{s=1}^{t_3} p_s^i \leq M\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty \mathfrak{D}^* + \omega - \mathfrak{C}^* \leq \mathfrak{D}^*, \tag{74}$$

and for $i \in \mathrm{V}_q^\infty$ there holds that

$$M \sum_{j \in \mathrm{N}_i} |a_{ij}| \max_{1 \leq s \leq t_3} \{p_s^j, q_s^j\} + \omega - \sum_{s=1}^{t_3} q_s^i \leq M\|A_{\mathrm{G}}\|_\infty \mathfrak{D}^* + \omega - \mathfrak{C}^* \leq \mathfrak{D}^*. \tag{75}$$

Thus, $p^i_{t_3+1} \leq \mathfrak{D}^*$ for $i \in \mathrm{V}_p^\infty$ and $q^i_{t_3+1} \leq \mathfrak{D}^*$ for $i \in \mathrm{V}_q^\infty$.

This leaves

$$\mathfrak{D}^* = \max\left\{p_s^j, q_s^j : 1 \leq s \leq t_3 + 1, j \in \mathrm{V}\right\}$$

being the only possibility. The recursive inequalities further ensure $\mathfrak{D}^* = \max\left\{p_s^j, q_s^j : 1 \leq s < \infty, j \in \mathrm{V}\right\} < \infty$, contradicting $\mathfrak{B}^* = \infty$. As a result, $\mathrm{V}_p^\infty$ is an empty set. For the same reason $\mathrm{V}_q^\infty$ is an empty set. In other words, if $M = 1/\|A_\mathrm{G}\|_\infty$, then for any $\omega > 0$ Eq. (13) implies $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty}(p_t^i + q_t^i) < \infty$ for all $i \in \mathrm{V}$. We have now proved $\|A_\mathrm{G}\|_\dagger \geq 1/\|A_\mathrm{G}\|_\infty$ by the definition of $\|A_\mathrm{G}\|_\dagger$. □

## References


[1] J. C. Maxwell, "On governors," *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.*, vol. 16, pp. 270–283, 1868.

[2] G. F. Franklin, J. D. Powell, and A. Emami-Naeini. *Feedback Control of Dynamic Systems.* 7th Edition, Prentice Hall, 2015.

[3] T. Basar and P. Bernhard. *$H^\infty$ Optimal Control and Related Minimax Design Problems: A Dynamic Game Approach.* Boston, MA: Birkhauser, 1991.

[4] G. Zames, "On the inputoutput stability of time-varying nonlinear systems Part I: Conditions using concepts of loop gain, conicity, and positivity," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 11, pp. 228–238, 1966.

[5] J. C. Doyle,"Analysis of feedback systems with structured uncertainties," *IEE Proc.*, vol. 133, pp. 45–56, 1982.

[6] M. Khammash and J. B. Pearson. "Performance robustness of discrete-time systems with structured uncertainty," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 36, 398–412, 1991.

[7] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, and K. Glover. *Robust and Optimal Control.* Prentice Hall, 1996.

[8] J. W. Helton and M. R. James. *Extending $H^\infty$ Control to Nonlinear Systems.* Frontiers in Applied Mathematics, SIAM, 1999.

[9] K. J. Åström and B. Wittenmark, "On self tuning regulators," vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 185–199, 1973.

[10] I. M. Y. Mareels, H. B. Penfold, and R. J. Evans, "Controlling nonlinear time-varying systems via Euler approximations," *Automatica*, vol. 28, pp. 681–696, 1992.

[11] E. Skafidas, A. Fradkov, R. J. Evans, and I. M. Y. Mareels, "Trajectory-approximation-based adaptive control for nonlinear systems under matching conditions," *Automatica*, vol. 34, pp. 287–299, 1998.

[12] C. L. Byrnes and W. Lin, "Losslessness, feedback equivalence and the global stabilization of discrete-time nonlinear systems," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 39, pp. 83–97, 1994.

[13] K. J. Åström and B. Wittenmark. *Adaptive Control*, 2nd Edition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1995.

[14] M. Krstić, I. Kanellakopoulos, and P. V. Kokotović. *Nonlinear and Adaptive Control Design*. New York: Wiley, 1995.

[15] W. S. Wong and R. W. Brockett, "Systems with finite communication bandwidth constraints: II. Stabilization with limited information feedback," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 1049–1053, 1999.

[16] G. N. Nair and R. J. Evans, "Stabilizability of stochastic linear systems with finite feedback data rates," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 413–436, 2004.

[17] D. Liberzon and J. P. Hespanha, "Stabilization of nonlinear systems with limited information feedback," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 910–915, 2005.

[18] G. N. Nair, F. Fagnani, S. Zampieri, R. J. Evans, "Feedback control under data rate constraints: an overview," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, Special issue on technology of networked control systems, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 108–137, 2007.

[19] G. N. Nair, "A nonstochastic information theory for communication and state estimation," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 1497–1510, 2013.

[20] L. Schenato, B. Sinopoli, M. Franceschetti, K. Poolla, and S. S. Sastry, "Foundations of control and estimation over lossy networks," *Procedings of IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 163–187, 2007.

[21] N. C. Martins and M. A. Dahleh, "Feedback control in the presence of noisy channels: Bode-like fundamental limitations of performance," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 53, no 7, pp. 1604–1615, 2008.

[22] A. Jadbabaie, J. Lin, and A. S. Morse, "Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous agents using nearest neighbor rules," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 988–1001, 2003.

[23] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, "Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1520–1533, 2004.

[24] S. Martinez, J. Cortes, and F. Bullo, "Motion coordination with distributed information," *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 75–88, 2007.

[25] A. Nedic, A. Ozdaglar and P. A. Parrilo, "Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 922–938, 2010.

[26] S. Mou, J, Liu, and A. S. Morse, "A distributed algorithm for solving a linear algebraic equation," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 60, no. 11, pp. 2863–2878, 2015.

[27] G. Shi, B. D. O. Anderson, and U. Helmke, "Network flows that solve linear equations. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, in press, [Online].

[28] M. Mesbahi and M. Egerstedt. *Graph Theoretic Methods in Multiagent Networks*. Princeton University Press, 2010.

[29] G. Shi, D. Dong, I. R. Petersen, and K. H. Johansson, "Reaching a quantum consensus: master equations that generate symmetrization and synchronization," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 374–387, 2016.

[30] A. Rahmani, M. Ji, M. Mesbahi, and M. Egerstedt, "Controllability of multi-agent systems from a graph-theoretic perspective," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 162–186, 2009.

[31] Y.-Y. Liu, J.-J. Slotine, and A.-L. Barabasi, "Controllability of complex networks," *Nature*, 473:167–173, 2011.

[32] A. Olshevsky, "Minimal controllability problems," *IEEE Trans. Control of Network Systems*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 249–258, 2014.

[33] L.-L. Xie and L. Guo, "How much uncertainty can be Dealt with by feedback?" *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 45, no. 12, pp. 2203–2217, 2000.

[34] C. Y. Li and L. Guo, "A new critical theorem for adaptive nonlinear stabilization," *Automatica*, vol. 46, pp. 999–1007, 2010.

[35] C. Y. Li and L. Guo,"On feedback capability in nonlinearly parameterized uncertain dynamical systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Contr.*, vol. 56, pp. 2946–2951, 2011.

[36] C. Huang and L. Guo, "On feedback capability for a class of semiparametric uncertain systems," *Automatica*, vol. 48, pp. 873–878, 2012.

[37] V. F. Sokolov, "Adaptive stabilization of parameter-affine minimum-phase plants under Lipschitz uncertainty," *Automatica*, vol. 73, pp. 64–70, 2016.

[38] A. Tahbaz-Salehi and A. Jadbabaie, "A one-parameter family of distributed consensus algorithms with boundary: From shortest paths to mean hitting times," in *45th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 4664–4669, 2006.

[39] S. Giannini, D. D. Paola, A. Petitti, and A. Rizzo, "On the convergence of the max-consensus protocol with asynchronous updates," in *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2013.

[40] F. Iutzeler, P. Ciblat, and J. Jakubowicz, "Analysis of max-consensus algorithms in wireless channels," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 60, pp. 6103–6107, 2012.